

REMARKS

[0001] Claims 1-21 are pending and stand rejected. The Office Action provisionally rejected Claims 1-21 on the grounds of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting. Claims 1-19 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 18 and 19 were objected to for informalities. Claims 13 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter applicant regards as the invention. Claims 1-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Hesmer et al., "Portlet Development Guide" Edition 1.1, pp 1-59, January 30, 2002 (hereinafter "Hesmer").

AMENDMENTS TO THE CLAIMS

[0002] Claims 1, 12, 16, 18, 20, and 21 were amended to clarify embodiments of the invention. Claim 3 was cancelled because the limitations of Claim 3 were incorporated into the preceding independent claim by amendment. Claim 13 and Claim 16 were amended to clarify claim language. The amendments will be addressed in relation to the corresponding rejections. Furthermore, Claim 5 was amended to be consistent with the amendment to Claim 1. No new matter has been added.

[0003] The Applicants wish to draw the Examiner's attention to independent Claims 12 and 18 that include additional limitations not found in the other independent claims. The Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of Claims 12 and 18 on their own merits based on these additional limitations.

REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-21 UNDER DOUBLE PATENTING

[0004] The Office Action provisionally rejected Claims 1-21 on the grounds of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting over Application No. 10/527,135. Applicants will file a terminal

disclaimer. Consequently, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claims 1-21 under double patenting be withdrawn.

REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-19 and 21 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §101

[0005] The Office Action rejected Claims 1-19 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 101. The Office Action rejected Claims 1-11 and 16-19, arguing that the claimed apparatus could embody software components. Claim 1 and Claim 16 have been amended to clarify that the “the shared portlet application session object [is] stored on a memory and executed by a processor.” This amendment finds support in the Specification in at least paragraph 131 which describes the parameter map as a memory object stored in the data store that is created per session. One skilled in the art realizes that a memory object that is stored is stored on memory that is executed by a processor.

[0006] Also, the Office Action rejected Claims 12-15, arguing that the claimed “Application” is also non-statutory. Claim 12 has also been amended to recite a memory and processor.

[0007] In addition, the Office Action rejected Claim 21 which claims “a computer readable signal bearing medium” as software per se. Claim 21 has been amended to recite a “computer readable storage medium.” Consequently Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claims 1-19 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 be withdrawn.

REJECTION OF CLAIMS 13 and 16 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §112

[0008] The Office Action rejected Claims 13 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 112. Specifically, the Office Action claims that the use of the term “etc.” renders the claims indefinite. These claims have been amended to remove the term “etc.” Consequently, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claims 13 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 be withdrawn.

REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-5 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

[0009] Claims 1-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Hesmer. “Anticipation under 35 U.S.C. §102 requires the disclosure in a single piece of prior art of each and every limitation of a claimed invention. . . . Whether such art is anticipating is a question of fact.” *Apple Computer, Inc. v. Articulate Systems, Inc.*, 234 F.3d 14, 20, 57 USPQ2d 1057, 1061 (Fed. Cir. 2000). It is well settled that under 35 U.S.C. §102 “an invention is anticipated if. . . all the claim limitations [are] shown in a single art prior art reference. Every element of the claimed invention must be literally present, arranged as in the claim. The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the patent claim.” *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co., Ltd.*, 9 U.S.P.Q.2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

[0010] Hesmer is a guide to portlet development. As such, Hesmer seems to describe deployment descriptors, Hesmer 2.4, portlet applications which form logical groups of portlets, *id.* 2.1, portlet context name/value pairs, *id.* at 3.6, and PortletSessions, created for each portlet on a page, *id.* at 3.7.

Claim 1

[0011] Applicants respectfully submit that amended Claim 1 clearly recites features not taught or suggested in Hesmer. Claim 1 as amended states:

1. (Currently Amended) Apparatus for a portal server system for managing a collection of associated portlets responsive to user requests to access a web application, the apparatus comprising:

a shared portlet application session object for saving parameters from user requests of associated portlets, **the shared portlet application session object accessible by each portlet in a portlet application and configured to allow each portlet in the portlet application to share session information, the shared portlet application session object stored on a memory and executed by a processor; and**

a portlet application communication client linked to said shared portlet application session object for communicating between said associated portlets and said web application to convey user requests received from said associated portlets to said web application.

Claim 1 as amended (emphasis added, strikethrough removed for clarity).

[0012] Claim 1 has been amended to clarify that a shared portlet application session object is used for saving parameters from user requests. Furthermore, the shared portlet application session object allows each portlet in a portlet application to share session information. The amendments to Claim 1 are fully supported by the Specification in at least ¶¶ 119 and 174-177 (describing a Portlet Application Session Object).

[0013] Hesmer does not teach “a shared portlet application session object for saving parameters from user requests of associated portlets, the shared portlet application session object accessible by each portlet in a portlet application and configured to allow each portlet in the portlet application to share session information.” Hesmer seems to teach a PortletSession, which holds “user-specific data for the virtual instance of the portlet.” Hesmer, sec. 3.7, p. 21. However, a PortletSession is created for each portlet and is not shared by each portlet in a portlet application as recited in amended Claim 1. Figure 2 of the Application shows a shared portlet application session object 208 that is shared by multiple portlets 205-207. A shared portlet application session object shared by the portlets of a portlet application allows the portlets to share session information.

[0014] For example, in a portlet application with bank account listings, selecting a different account from the account list in one portlet allows another portlet to display invoice information from the account selected. See Specification, ¶ 201. Another example illustrates the functionality of the shared portlet application session object: if portlet OrderedItems receives an HTTP request with attribute itemName set to "PentiumIV," OrderedItems sends information (name/value pair) to the portlets

UPSTracking and InStockInventory notifying them that itemName with value "PentiumIV" has been now set. *See* Specification, ¶¶ 214, 215, 234.

[0015] While Hesmer appears to teach a portlet application, which is a group of portlets, Hesmer fails to teach any concept of shared portlet application session object.

[0016] Because Hesmer fails to teach the limitations of amended Claim 1 including a "shared portlet application session object," Hesmer fails to anticipate Claim 1 as amended. Consequently, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) be withdrawn. Furthermore, Claims 16 and 20 that includes similar limitations to Claim 1 are also allowable for at least the same reasons as Claim 1. Furthermore, Claims 2, 4-11, 17, and 21 depend from independent claims that are allowable, as described above. *See In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Consequently Applicant requests that the rejection of dependent Claims 2, 4-11, 17, and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 be withdrawn.

Claim 12

[0017] Applicants respectfully submit that amended Claim 12 clearly recites features not taught or suggested in Hesmer. Claim 12 as amended states:

12. (Currently Amended) A portlet application for managing a collection of associated portlets in a portal, for operating on a server providing access to a web application by a user;

said associated portlets having portlet request parameter maps storing data and instructions from user requests to said portlets;

a shared portlet application session object for said user for said associated portlets, the shared portlet application session object accessible by each portlet in a portlet application, the shared portlet application session object stored on a memory and executed by a processor;

a shared portlet application session data store controlled by said shared portlet application session object, the shared portlet application session

data store configured to allow each portlet in the portlet application to share session information;

a portlet application communication client linked to said portlet application data store for communicating between said associated portlets and said web application to convey user requests received from said associated portlets to said web application; and

said communication client having a request buffer for storing requests from portlet request parameter maps of said associated portlets to enable said communication client to provide data and instructions for said web application.

Claim 12 has been amended with similar limitations as Claim 1 as described above. In addition, Claim 12 has been amended to clarify that the portlet application session data store is shared by each portlet and that the shared portlet application session data store allows each portlet in the portlet application to share session information. This amended is supported in the Specification by at least ¶¶ 119 and 131 of the Specification.

[0018] As described above, Hesmer appears to describe a portlet session and portlet session object. Hesmer also appears to describe storing user related data in a session object. Hesmer, page 5, third paragraph. However, Hesmer fails to teach a “shared portlet application session data store.” Beneficially, the shared portlet application session data store allows the portlets in a portlet application to share data through the shared portlet application session object as described above.

[0019] Because Hesmer fails to teach the all of the limitations of Claim 12 as amended including a “shared portlet application session data store,” amended Claim 12 is not anticipated by Hesmer. Consequently, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) be withdrawn. Furthermore, Claim 18 that includes similar limitations to Claim 12 is also allowable for at least the same reasons as Claim 12. Furthermore, Claims 13-15 and 19 depend from independent claims that are allowable, as described above. Applicant requests that the rejection of dependent Claims -15 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

[0020] In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that the application is in condition for immediate allowance. In the event any questions or issues remain that can be resolved with a supplemental phone call, the Examiner is respectfully requested to initiate a telephone conference with the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 6, 2009
8 East Broadway, Suite 600
Salt Lake City, UT 84111
Telephone (801) 994-4646

_ / David J. McKenzie / _____
David J. McKenzie
Reg. No. 46,919
Attorney for Applicants